

Claim 1 calls for a video tape recorder including, among other things, means for recording a first time code stepped in a non-drop-frame format and a second time code stepped in a dropped-frame format together with the selected recording frame rate.

Claim 6 calls for a recording apparatus including, among other things, a second recording circuit for recording the plurality of time code counts from the time code generator circuit on the recording medium. Claim 6 further calls for a time code method selection and recording circuit for selecting a time code count from the plurality of time code counts generated by the time code generator circuit, and for recording the selected time code count on the recording medium in response to the second controlling signal from the control circuit.

Claim 12 includes similar elements, namely a recording medium processing means for, among other things, recording both the first time code count and the second time code count from the time code generating means on the recording medium, as well as a time code selection means for selecting a time code counting method from among the first time code counting method and the second time code counting method based on the second control signal from the control means.

Finally, claim 14 claims a method of recording video signals at a plurality of frame rates including a step of recording the plurality of time code counts on the recording medium.

These features of the pending claims are not taught or suggested by Suzuki or Okauchi either alone or in combination. Examiner admits in paragraph 3 of the Office Action that Suzuki does not disclose means for recording a first time code stepped in a non-drop frame format and a second time code stepped in a drop frame format on the recording medium together with the

selected recording frame rate. For this claim feature the Examiner relies on the teaching of Okauchi at column 5, lines 8-66. However, the Examiner apparently misreads Okauchi. At lines 9-14 Okauchi describes a drop-frame/non-drop-frame switching signal. The drop-frame/non-drop-frame switching signal assumes a high level or a low level based on the state of a manual switch. Either the drop-frame counting format or the non-drop-frame format may be selected, i.e. one format or the other based on the high or low value of the drop-frame/non-drop-frame switching signal, not both. Furthermore, in describing the time code pulses output from the encoder 3 of Fig. 2, Okauchi states that the time-coded pulses are supplied to a recording amplifier 7 and then fed to a well known CTL head 8 to be recorded as the control track of the magnetic tape. Okauchi only records one type of time-code pulses on the tape: either drop-frame coded pulses or non-drop frame coded pulses. Nowhere does Okauchi disclose recording both drop-frame and non-drop-frame pulses on the tape. Thus, even if one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Suzuki and Okauchi as suggested by the Examiner, a point not conceded by the Applicant, the result nonetheless fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention as a whole. For these reasons the claims of the present application are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Suzuki and Okauchi.

Applicant therefore submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner allow the application to issue. However, if there are any remaining issues the Examiner is encourage to call Applicant's attorney, Jeffrey H. Canfield at (312) 807-4233 in order to facilitate a speedy disposition of the present case.

If any additional fees are required in connection with this response they may be charged  
to deposit account no. 02-1818.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:

  
Jeffrey H. Canfield  
Reg. No. 38,404

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC  
P.O. Box 1135  
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135  
(312) 807-4233